



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO. 6	FILING DATE/98	JONES FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
			10236-000810

MM51/1221
[ROGER L. COOK
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW
8TH FLOOR
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER
JACKSON, S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2036	

DATE MAILED: 12/21/98

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/044,216

Applicant(s)
Jonathan L Jones et al

Examiner
Stephen Jackson

Group Art Unit
2836



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jul 6, 1998

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☒ Claim(s) 9-12 and 17-20 is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1 and 13-16 is/are rejected.

☒ Claim(s) 2-8 is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2836

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1 and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al.

Anderson et al teaches a poly crystalline varistor (known to have a significant capacitance) of the bulk effect zinc oxide base type adapted for use in voltage surge suppression on VHF signal lines. The device comprises a unitary body including a spiral inductor 15 electrically in series with the varistor element to prevent capacitive loading of the protected signal line. The Anderson device differs from the claims by including a varistor in the connection between the line to be protected and ground, and by not being said to use a particular formula to select the size and impedance of the spiral inductor for a given signal line.

Art Unit: 2836

It would have been obvious to use the teachings of Anderson to meet to claims because the language of claim 1 does not exclude the connection of a spiral inductor with other circuit elements between the signal line and ground, and the inductor selection considerations of claims 13-16 fail to include any non-arbitrary factor that would produce improved or special results compared with selection methods available to persons of ordinary skill in the art.

Claims 2-8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 9-12 and 17-20 are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Stephen Jackson at telephone number (703) 308-2137.

SWJackson

12-18-98

Stephen W Jackson
PATENT
EXAMINER
12-18-98